

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 through 8 are pending in the application.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge approval of the proposed drawing corrections.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wani in view of Kida et al.

In response to Applicant's previous arguments and amendments, the Examiner states, *inter alia*, that Wani teaches driving methods wherein the subfields representing the lower significant bits are displayed by interlace scanning, and wherein two lines are addressed simultaneously with the same data. This is true. However, in itself, these techniques, while reducing the addressing period and thus increasing the sustain period and consequently increasing the display brightness, result in a loss of resolution and/or sharpness. See, e.g., page 3, lines 9-14 of Applicant's specification. ²

Next, the Examiner urges that Kida et al. assigns the same luminance value to neighboring lines. Wani's second technique also involves addressing neighboring lines simultaneously. See col. 2, lines 30-32. However, Wani applies this technique in a short scanning time (col. 2, line 29), meaning applying it to the least significant bits (col. 3, lines 34-36 and lines 51-58). On the other hand, Kida et al. does not distinguish between most significant bits and least significant bits. Thus, the technique of Kida et al. applies to the entire display signal, and accordingly would be expected to result in a much

greater loss of resolution and/or sharpness than Wani's techniques.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that Kida et al. teaches 'light emitting periods for each of the sub-frames of one frame'. However, this teaching in itself suggests nothing with respect to how each of the sub-frames are treated or whether any of the sub-frames differ from one another.

Next, the Examiner states that Wani teaches partial interface (sic) scanning only in subfields corresponding to lower bits that have a shorter sustaining period and a small contribution to brightness. This is the first technique already described by Applicant, which results in a loss of resolution and/or sharpness, as compared to Applicant's technique.

Nevertheless, the Examiner urges that it would have been obvious to allow the lower bits to be driven with a common luminance value, thereby increasing the quality of the display.

However, nothing in either of the cited references teaches or suggests the result urged by the Examiner. As already explained, in failing to discriminate between most significant bits and least significant bits, Kida et al. would actually result in greater degradation in picture quality than Wani.

It can only be with the aid of hindsight gained from Applicant's own teachings that the addressing of the same or average luminance date to adjacent lines of only the least significant subframes becomes obvious, and such hindsight is not permitted in judging obviousness under Section 103.

Moreover, Applicant's invention, as set forth in claim 1, is further characterized in that such addressing is performed differently for (i) successive frames or fields and/or (ii) for different regions of the display device and/or (iii) for different subfields.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 are not unpatentable over Wani in view of Kida et al., and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Wani in view of Kida et al. and further in view of Huang.

Without conceding the patentability per se of claim 4, it is urged that claim 4 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, and that therefore the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Wani in view of Kida et al. and further in view of Nagai.

Without conceding the patentability per se of claim 6, it is urged that claim 6 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, and that therefore the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Wani in view of Kida et al. and further in view of Prince et al.

Without conceding the patentability per se of claim 7, it is urged that claim 7 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, and that therefore the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584